



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/090,492	03/04/2002	Timothy A.M. Chuter	ENDOV-55673	5068
24201	7590	10/25/2005	EXAMINER	
FULWIDER PATTON LEE & UTECHT, LLP HOWARD HUGHES CENTER 6060 CENTER DRIVE TENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90045			THALER, MICHAEL H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3731	
DATE MAILED: 10/25/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

6

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/090,492	CHUTER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael Thaler	3731	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 August 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-13, 15, 29-46, 48, 49, 56, 61, 62, 70, 72-79 and 87-93 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-13, 15, 29-46, 48, 49, 56, 61, 62, 70, 72-79 and 87-93 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 June 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 14, 2005 has been entered.

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Reference numeral 49 in the amendment to the specification filed June 14, 2005 is not consistent with reference numeral 79 in the proposed amendment to the drawings filed June 14, 2005. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 90 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. All of the limitations in claim 90 are present in claim 72 from which it depends

Claim 90 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as

Art Unit: 3731

the invention. In line 2, it is unclear if "the expandable frame" refers to the first or second expandable frame recited in claim 72.

Claims 9-13, 15, 29-33, 35-40, 42, 56, 61, 62, 70, 72, 88-90, 92 and 93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kugler et al. (6,280,466). Kugler et al., in figures 3B and 6A, disclose graft component 45 having an opening and a plurality of structures (the triangular tabs at the top of the graft component 45 as seen in figure 3B and described in col. 15, lines 32-34) extending longitudinally beyond the opening (which extends around the circumference of the graft component 45 in a circle which intersects the lowest point of each V-shaped opening between the triangular tabs and which extends across each base of the triangular tabs), expandable frame 50 (described in col. 10, lines 7-9, which is independently expandable from the caudal zone as indicated in col. 8, lines 46-48 and col. 9, lines 51-54 and thus, by itself, may be considered a "frame"), attaching structure 55, anchoring structure (the barbs 58 which can be placed at the cranial end 50 as indicated in col. 11, lines 61-63), wherein the expandable frame 50 is longitudinally separated from the graft component 45 (by members 55), wherein the attaching structure 55 attaches the

Art Unit: 3731

expandable frame to the graft component at discrete locations on the graft component (i.e. at the apexes of the triangular tabs) so that less than an entirety of a graft circumference is affixed to the attaching structure 55 and wherein the opening of the graft component 45 lacks other structure supporting a totality of the opening circumference. Caudal zone 52 of stent 10 of Kugler et al. is located generally longitudinally distal to the opening of the graft component and only intersects the opening at spaced intervals (at the bottom of struts 53a, 53b, 53c, 53d as seen in figure 6A and near the lowest point of each V-shaped opening between the triangular tabs as seen in figure 3B) and therefore does not support a totality of the opening circumference. Thus, although caudal zone 52 of stent 10 is near the opening of the graft component, it does not support a totality of the opening circumference. Even applicant's invention includes a stent 50 (shown in figures 3C, 3D and 3E) which supports the graft near the opening and even intersects the graft opening at spaced intervals at the top of the stent 50. Applicant does not consider stent 50 of applicant's invention to support a totality of the opening circumference of the graft. Alternatively, it would have been obvious that member 50 of Kugler et al., by itself, is a "frame" for the reasons set forth above. As to claims 12 and 13, the edge

Art Unit: 3731

portions of each tab would inherently be wrapped partially around the struts 53a, b ,c, d when sutures (at 25) are wrapped around the struts and bite into the graft material as described in col. 15, line 37 to col. 16, line 4, resulting in a folding of each tab to some extent. As to claim 35, the end portion of barb 58 comprises a tail. As to claim 36, barb 58 is at the end of an edge of a strut. As to claims 38-40, Kugler et al. disclose reinforcing stent 30. As to claim 61, the endpoints of stent 30 at one end are longitudinally offset from the endpoints at the opposite end. As to claim 70, radiopaque markers 28a-28e are variable sized as seen in figure 3B, noting that some markers extend longitudinally to a greater extent than others. As to claim 72, Kugler et al. disclose first expandable frame 50 and second expandable frame 30. As to claim 88, the Kugler et al. reinforcing structures, expandable frame and anchoring structure are non-overlapping.

Claims 34, 43-46, 48, 49 and 73-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kugler et al. (6,280,466). As to claim 34, Kugler et al. fail to disclose the barb being bidirectional. However, it was well known in this art to make stent barbs bidirectional so that they are securely attached to the artery. It would have been obvious to make the Kugler et al. barbs 58 bidirectional so that it too would have

Art Unit: 3731

this advantage. The above well known in the art statement is taken to be admitted prior art because applicant failed to traverse the examiner's assertion (M.P.E.P. 2144.03). As to claims 43 and 73, Kugler et al. fail to disclose the stent 30 as including a barb. However, Kugler et al. teach that stents (e.g. at 52) should include barbs so that they can be securely attached to the artery (col. 11, lines 58-63). It would have been obvious to include barbs on the Kugler et al. stent 30 so that this stent too would have this advantage. As to claims 89 and 93, the first leg portion is attached along its length to the second leg portion.

Claims 41, 87 and 91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kugler et al. (6,280,466) in view of Dehdashtian et al. (6,368,345). As to claim 41, Kugler et al. fail to disclose the stent 30 being on the exterior of the graft component. However, Dehdashtian et al. teach that stents should be placed both on the exterior and interior of a graft apparently to properly support it (col. 11, line 55 to col. 12, line 4). It would have been obvious to so locate the stents on the Kugler et al. graft so that it too would have this advantage.

Art Unit: 3731

Applicant's arguments filed June 14, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the reasons set forth above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Thaler whose telephone number is (571)272-4704. The examiner can normally be reached Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anhtuan T. Nguyen can be reached on (571)272-4963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)273-8300.

mht
10/19/05



MICHAEL THALER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3731